

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 20 have been amended. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-12 and 14-33 are pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-12 and 14-33 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hoover et al. (U.S. Patent 5,724,575) (hereinafter “Hoover”) in view of Dutcher et al. (U.S. Patent 6,269,405) (hereinafter “Dutcher”).

In regard to claim 1, in the Analysis section, on pages 8-9 of the Decision on Appeal of July 14, 2010, the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (hereinafter “the Board”) “agree[s] with Appellant that the map table in Figure 7 [of Hoover] does not store data about the user of the multiple computer resources,” but goes on to assert “‘a virtual identity for a user of multiple computer resources’ [as claim 1 currently recites] does not recite such a limitation.” The Board goes on to state that “Claim 1 [as written] only requires an identity that can be used by any user, i.e., a virtual identity ‘for’ a user, not ‘**of**’ a user.”

In view of the Board’s finding that Hoover “does not store data about the user of the multiple computer resources,” claim 1 has been amended to recite “a virtual identity of a user of multiple computer resources.” Applicant asserts that, as per the Board’s findings, this amendment overcomes the § 103(a) rejection of claim 1 to Hoover and Dutcher. Thus, for at least the reason presented above, the rejection of claim 1 is not supported by the cited art and removal thereof is respectfully requested.

In regard to claim 20, the claim has been amended to recite “a plurality of virtual identities of users of multiple computer resources, wherein each virtual identity corresponds to a particular user of multiple computer resources.” Applicant asserts that this amendment overcomes the rejection of claim 20 for at least the reasons given above in regard to claim 1, namely that the Board agrees with Applicant that “the map table in

Figure 7 [of Hoover] does not store data about the user of the multiple computer resources.” Thus, for at least the reason presented above, the rejection of claim 20 is not supported by the cited art and removal thereof is respectfully requested.

In regard to claim 26, on pages 8 of the Decision on Appeal, the Board found that “claim 26 is more specific in reciting ‘an identity index comprising a plurality of information object identifiers corresponding to a set of information objects that define a user of multiple computer resources.’” However, since “claim 26 is not separately argued,” the Board “[did] not decide whether this difference in language is sufficient to define over Hoover.” However, since the Board agrees, in regard to claim 1, that “the map table in Figure 7 [of Hoover] does not store data about the user of the multiple computer resources,” Applicant asserts that claim 26, as currently written, does distinguish over the teachings of the cited art. Thus, for at least the reason presented above, the rejection of claim 26 is not supported by the cited art and removal thereof is respectfully requested.

Applicant also asserts that the rejection of numerous ones of the dependent claims is further unsupported by the cited art. In particular, the rejection of claims 17-19 was reversed by the Board. However, since the rejection has been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-96802/RCK.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/
Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255
Attorney for Applicants

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: September 14, 2010